U.S. v. Bolden 14907

Page 463 - 49(2) - the defendant believes that to strike testimony of Edward Miller because no "government representative" was present is prima facie evidence that the "trial" of the defendant was a mere hearing for the purpose of finding the defendant guilty.

Page 454 - 641(1) - Attorney for defendant during interrogation was denied by Special Agent in Charge Maurice G. Martineau in the presence of: U.S. Attorney Edward Hanrahan, Chief Secret Service Inspector Michael Terina, Secret Service Inspector Gerard McCann

Further, the defendant was placed in a "line up" in the grand jury room. Frank Jones was arrested by the defendant, knew the defendant, and swore vengence against the defendant. Spagnoli also knew the defendant. If the secret service were acting upon the statement of Spagnoli and Jones who both knew the defendant, what was the purpose of a "police line up" and what person was to identify the defendant and for what reason? Is a line up a voluntary act upon the part of the defendant? The U.S. Supreme Court says that it is not voluntary.

Page 454 - 958 (c)

Frank Oliver, attorney for Spagnoli, had a pre-trial conversation with prosecutor Sikes and Judge Perry in which Oliver agreed not to raise the Bolden trials during the prosecution of Spagnoli. Attorney Oliver, and Spagnoli will verify this fact. Why was there a prior agreement between the government and Spagnoli's attorneys? See U.S. vs. D'Antonio, 64 CR 300 - Judge Perry admits prior conversation concerning testimony of Spagnoli and further stated that Spagnoli's statements "places the government in a very bad position to -" (See page 6283 U.S. v. D'Antonio)

Page 454 (1) The report was never found. Agent Cross 1st testified that he did not read or touch the report. In the second trial he finally admitted that he read the report and left his office for 15 minutes and upon return the report was gone. The defendant had said onion skin copy of the report from April 27 to May 8th. The government claims that my brief and "true" conversation with Spagnoli on May 9th planted the "seeds of corruption" in to the mind of the defendant. In other words, the government prosecutors are asking the public to believe that the defendant stole the report back from Agent Cross on May 8th, 1964 (before the arrest of Spagnoli).

for no reason at all; (2) Held the report until May 11th and anticipated a conversation with Spagnoli on May 9th. Remember, the idea was planted on May 9th according to prosecutors Sikes and Dunne. Then, why steal the report on May 8th at somewhere between 8:30a and 10:00 a.m when the decision to arrest Spagnoli was not made by Mr. Martineau until 3:00 p.m at an agent's meeting in the office. No one in the office knew that Spagnoli would be arrested on May 9th, 1964 except SAIC Maurice G. Martineau, John Russell and possibly the Chief of the U.S. Secret Service.... UNTIL 3:00 p.m, May 8, 1964, 6 hours after the report was (stolen?). The (theft?) of the report was not reported by Special Agent Cross until May 18, 1964 when the defendant was arrested. Why ??? Prior to May 8th, 1964, the defendant conducted no investigation concerning Joseph Spagnoli - Until the meeting after the report was stolen. The defendant was told (May 9th) by agent Jim Griffiths to go into the office where Spagnoli was being questioned. It was not upon the initiative of the defendant and no conversation with Spagnoli was had by the defendant prior to Jim Griffiths request or after the request... excluding Terre Haute Prison where Spagnoli made

other revealing disclosures when we were in custody together.

Page 455 (1) In the sign sworn statement of Frank Jones dated May 18, 1964, there is no reference to $50,000 nor is there any reference to Sandra Hafford. In his "revised statement" dated on or about May 22nd, 1964 (After the cross accusations of laxity in protection of President Kennedy), Jones suddenly remembers that the sum $50,000 was mentioned and so was the name Sandra Hafford.

Page 455 (2) The arrangement to dye Sandra's hair was not made by the secret service as stated by John E. Russell in the trial. Other sources of information reveal that Sandra Hafford arranged for her "aunt" to dye her hair on the night of May 12, 1964. She made the call to her "aunt," Joanne ——, who agreed to dye her hair. Sandra called Russell by telephone and told him, not ask, that her "aunt" was to dye her hair. Joanne is allegedly a better friend of Squeaki than Sandra realized at the time.

Page 455 (3) Spagnoli first called mr. martineau on May 12, 1964 at approximately 5:30 p.m. according to reliable sources. Spagnoli was told to change the date from May 12th to May 13th in a meeting with Prosecutor Sikes during the interim period between the 1st and 2nd trial. Why? Because in the 1st trial, Spagnoli testified that the call was made on the 12th; Martineau swore the 13th. There was too much conflict in the testimony; therefore someone had to change testimony. Spagnoli was given the assignment. Proof: On the night of May 12th, 1964, Spagnoli called the F.B.I (call should show on log sheet of the F.B.I and assigned F.B.I. agent) and reported that he had called mr. Martineau and attempted to report a bribe. The F.B.I refused to accept the story. Spagnoli then called a newspaper reporter who went to Spagnoli's home and in the presence of the reporter, Spagnoli tried to make contact with Frank Jones by telephone. the reporter was from the Chicago's American Newspaper and the details of Spagnoli's call to Martineau appears in the evening edition, page one, Chicago's American Newspaper, May 20th, 1964. Further Proof: Agent James (Jim Plichta) received a call from "Joe" (identified as Joseph Spagnoli) on the night of May 12th, 1964 stating that he had tried to talk to mr. Martineau earlier that evening and mr. Martineau had refused to talk to him. Martineau explained

Page 455 (3) con't
that the whole thing was a "hoax". Plichta steadfastly refused to give "Joe" Mr. Martineau's telephone number. This call to Plichta was monitored by the Chicago's American reporter on an extension telephone in Spagnoli's home.

Page 455 (4) Refer to oral evidence and our conversation of August 7th, 1967.

Page 455 (5) Obvious lie by Martineau. Proof: ① On May 18, 1964, the defendant did not own a typewriter, - the only typewriter was one belonging to my wife: ② Martineau says that he received permission to check the typewriter. Why was the permission not written as required by law? At the very time of the initiation of my illegal interrogation on May 18, 1964 at 6:30 p.m., the secret service agents Myron R. Weinstein and John E. Russell were at the home of the defendant taking possession (illegally) of the typewriter. This search was witnessed by two Chicago Policeman called by the wife of this defendant. Permission (written) was given for a polygraph test by the defendant, yet nowhere does Martineau state that he sought or obtained the fruits of the alleged exculpatory statement

Page 455 (A)

in written permission from an agent who was acting "voluntarily." Why? Because it is a mere contraction of martineau to strengthened the (case?) against an illegally held defendant. Would U.S. Attorney Hanrahan, who was present, immediately get such an important "exculpatory statement" in writing? That's elementary police procedure — unless permission was never given.

Page 455 (C)

Richard Walter is a secret service informant who was deemed "unreliable" by Special Agent in Charge Harry W. Geiglein in 1962. He is also a counterfeiter having been arrested for "Green Goods Confidence Game". This fact was not known during the trial.

Also, on or about May 31, 1964, Richard Walters made a telephone call to my home. I subsequently found that Walters was calling from the secret service office surrounded by Prosecutor Sikes, Myron R. Weinstein, Richard A. Jordan, and Mr. Maurice G. Martineau who listened on an extension. The defendant refused to talk with Walter who was told by defendant's wife "he's not home".

Now, why was this fact concealed? Maybe someone might get the impression that Walters was trying

Page 455 (c)

to trap the defendant for the secret service. Why would the U.S. Government permit an informant to call a defendant with instructions to talk about killing Jones - monitor the conversation, and conceal the matter afterwards? Borders upon ~~entrapment~~, doesn't it?

Summary: In April, 1964, Mr. Maurice G. Martineau sent the defendant to the home of Frank William Jones. Jones had complained that after his car was seized from him in 1963 and returned in 1964, he was missing a camera and camera lens from the car trunk. Jones stated that in place of his camera and lens, he found an old typewriter. During the investigation, Jones reported the missing items to the Bureau of Customs, 610 S. Canal. Two Customs agents interviewed the defendant, agent J. Lloyd Stocks, and Mr. Maurice G. Martineau concerning the missing items.

During the trial Mr. Martineau denied (both trials) that any investigation of the above nature took place; However, reports of the defendant's daily activities for April, 1964 says that Mr. Martineau is not telling the whole truth and nothing but the truth. Those reports are on file at this very moment: Plus, the Customs agents also filed a report.

Summary:

Question: Why commit perjury about an investigation involving an "old typewriter"? Unless there is something to hide - like Jones' "old typewriter" was used to type the excerpt and that would not be consonant with the guilt of the defendant. Where is his old typewriter? Jones knows. So does a few others.

Finally:

① Jones was a secret service informer registered as such by the U.S. Secret Service in 1964 in Chicago and Washington, D.C. He was given a secret service informant number.

② Joseph Spagnoli was a secret service informer after May 9, 1964. Spagnoli was known by Agent John E. Russell as "Joe" and conversations between Russell and "Joe" were recorded, analyzed by Martineau and it was ascertained that "Joe" the informer was Joe Spagnoli. I know why Spagnoli would conceal his mysterious informer role with the secret service, but in the trial of an agent, why would the service conceal the fact that Josph Spagnoli was John Russell's informant?

Conclusion:

Secret Service informant Frank Jones, secret service informant Joseph Spagnoli, and secret service informant Richard Walters, testified against secret service agent Bolden; but only one informant was identified to the jury. Why were the others concealed?

I hope that this will shed a ray of light into the facts of this case. I hope that the above information will clear up and bring this matter to an early conclusion

Yours very truly

Abraham W. Bolden

9255 P.C.